REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 11 has been amended in order to give the claim a proper antecedent basis.

In a non-final Office Action mailed on April 30, 2008, claims 11-14 of the Application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Berman. Berman describes a video signal data and composite synchronization extraction circuit for on-screen display. In particular, the cited portions of Berman teach vertical pulse detection by means of a digital counting circuit. Col. 16, lines 37-52. The circuit 101 determines the occurrence a vertical pulse in the incoming signal, and also identifies the field. Col. 16, lines 64-67. This time period is measured by digital integration, which is advantageous according to Berman because it is insensitive to distortions in the vertical pulse interval. Col. 16 line 65- col. 17, line 1. In short, Berman teaches improving noise performance to detect a vertical pulse interval, and identifying the field.

In contrast to Berman, the limitations of claims 11-14 disclose a method and apparatus for the detection of copy protection included in an input video signal. Claim 11 discloses counting the number of copy protection pulses within a field. The limitations of claim 11 disclose that if enough copy protection pulses are detected, then the video input signal is copy protected.

With regard to claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 11 is inappropriate because the cited reference does not teach the limitations of claim 11. The cited portion of Berman (col. 16, line 61 to col. 18, lines 34) discloses sampling the composite synchronization and accumulating the number of times that the composite synchronization is

6

high during those samples. If the number of high samples exceeds a certain threshold, <u>then the signal is determined to be a vertical pulse interval</u>. However, the cited portion fails to disclose an accumulated count of the number of copy protection pulses for multiple fields, or a decision based on the comparison of the accumulated count to a second threshold. Claim 11 discloses, in part, a field pulse comparator which "compares the accumulated count of detected pulse for each field with a second threshold, wherein when the accumulated count exceeds the second threshold for a field, the field pulse comparator asserts a positive count indication for the field." In contrast, the cited portion merely counts the number of samples in a vertical pulse interval. Furthermore, the cited portion fails to disclose asserting a positive count indication where the count exceeds a second threshold. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is suitable for allowance.

Additionally, with regard to claim 11, the cited reference fails to teach a decision counter which affects a decision count based on the number of copy protection pulses in an entire field. The reference inherently cannot teach a decision counter because the reference does not teach counting the number of copy protection pulses for a field. More specifically, the cited portion of <u>Berman</u> (col. 17, lines 9-66) discloses a counter which counts the number of times that the composite synchronization is high during a sample, in order to identify a vertical pulse time. If the signal is high during a certain number of samples, then a vertical pulse interval has been detected. However, the cited reference fails to disclose a decision that <u>is coupled to a field pulse comparator</u>. Claim 11 also discloses, in part, a "decision counter [that] increments a decision count when the positive count indication is asserted for a field and decrements the decision count when the positive count indication is not asserted for a field." In contrast, the cited reference does not count the number of pulses on a per-field basis, nor does the cited reference maintain a

decision count describing the number of positive count indications. In other words, the cited reference does not keep track of how many fields contain a certain threshold of copy protection pulses. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is suitable for allowance.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach a decision comparator that sets a pulses detected indication when the decision count reaches a high threshold, and clears the pulse detected indication when the decision count reaches a low threshold. The cited portion of Berman (col. 15, line 66 to col. 16, line 24) discloses controlling the action of a phase comparator based on the outputs of a frequency comparator. The cited reference further discloses a phase comparator that causes a current pump to sink or source a fixed current based on a signal variable. However, the cited portion does not disclose comparing the number of fields containing copy protection pulses to a high and low threshold. The limitations of claim 11 teach, in part, setting and clearing a pulses detected indication based on the comparison between the decision count and a threshold. Applicant respectfully submits that the reference to a phase comparator and a frequency comparator is unrelated to the comparison of a decision count to a threshold. Claim 11 is therefore suitable for allowance.

Applicant notes that claims 12-14 are dependent on claim 11. Thus, the arguments presented above apply equally to claims 12-14 and are incorporated by this reference.

Additionally, with regard to claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach a blanking interval gate in conjunction with a field pulse comparator and corresponding decision counter as claimed. Instead, the cited portion of Berman (col. 14, lines 45-66) teaches a horizontal phase comparator that eliminates the static phase error of conventional circuits by integrating the phase error through the use of a current pump and loop

8

filter network. In contrast to the cited reference, claim 13 discloses a blanking interval gate that selectively passes the pulse detect indication derived from the information from the field pulse comparator that is based on a received signal indicating that the input video signal is in the vertical blanking interval. Thus, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

For at least the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the limitations of claim 11-14, which are therefore suitable for allowance. Applicant's attorney invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would help expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 18, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005

9